

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/597,196

Applicant(s)

ZIMMERMAN, JOHN

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

All Participants:

(1) Kristie Shingles, Examiner.

(2) Yan Glickberg, Atty. 51,742.

Status of Application: Reopened - Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 8 November 2006

Time: 11:30am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

5, 9, 14 and 16

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Atty to discuss the possible allowability of independent claims 9 and 14; while suggesting the cancellation of claim 5 (along with its dependents) and the incorporation of claim 16 into claim 14 for consistency with claim 9, specifically for claim 14 to include the second remote device as featured in claim 9 and 16. Atty suggested incorporating the first two limitations of claim 16 into claim 14 as opposed to adding the entire claim. Examiner acknowledged the possible allowability of Atty's proposal. In order to expedite prosecution, Examiner asked for permission to perform an Examiner's Amendment with the proposed changes. Atty declined and preferred to receive an action re-opening prosecution for the case. Examiner re-opened prosecution and further updated the search in light of the Applicant's remarks in the After-Final filed on 10/5/06..